

1996P08661WOIUS01
Rosenbaum *et al.*

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Drawings

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for including blank boxes. Figure 1 has been amended to include words and abbreviations within boxes for labeling purposes. The remaining figures do not include unlabeled boxes. Figure 1 is enclosed with this response. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

In paragraphs 2 and 3, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 14-22 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenbaum *et al.* (US Patent 5,031,223). Applicants traverse.

The present invention is directed to a system for resolving destination addresses of mail items wherein an OCR processor, associated with a scanner and address directory, comprises, among other means, means for decoding an image and means for redecoding the *entire* image. The decoding and redecoding are performed on an image's region of interest (page 5, lines 23 *et seq.*), the image being that of an address face of the mail item and the region of interest being that portion which actually comprises the address itself. The decoding is effected by way of extraction coding (see steps 1-3, page 7) whereby known portions of the address are compared with data in the address directory in order to arrive at a complete address. Per claim 1, the results of the means for decoding are used to limit the address database which then becomes the comparison with the results of the means for redecoding. The redecoding includes a likelihood of success because with extraction coding now at least two known parts of the address are being compared with a smaller amount of data. Additionally, the entire image is subject to the redecoding as oppose to portions thereof.

1996P08661 WOUS01
Rosenbaum *et al.*

Rosenbaum ('223) is also directed to mail item address resolution. The Examiner has indicated that the instant means for redecoding is disclosed in '223, column 9, lines 6-14. To support this position, the Examiner notes that "the work station can perform a data base look up of street names, whose spelling most closely approximate the alphanumeric character string and operator can select the appropriate alternative spelling, which is inserted at the selected street name into the portion of the address data block". As detailed above, the decoding and redecoding is extraction coding wherein portions of address data are compared to limited data sets. '223, as noted by the Examiner, is essentially directed to spell checking. Should one attempt to spell check portions of addresses as used in extraction coding, one would surely not arrive at a meaningful address regardless of any supporting database. Additionally, and to further emphasis the distinctions with the prior art, claim 1 has been amended to expressly recite that the entire image is subject to redecoding so as to distinguish from the prior art's redecoding (i.e. spell checking) of only a portion of the image. For at least these reasons, '223 does not anticipate claim 1.

The remaining rejected claims depend from claim 1. Accordingly, at least for the reasons set out above, the remaining rejected claims are not anticipated by '223.

The instant and '223 systems are directed to different means with the latter not anticipating the former. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

In paragraph 5, the Examiner rejected claims 11-13 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over '223 in view of Mampe (US Patent 4,992,469). Applicants traverse.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 1. '223 does not disclose the instant decoding and redecoding as set out above. Mampe was relied upon to teach the use of a delay loop in mail handling systems. Mampe does not disclose the instant decoding and redecoding limitations. Neither reference redecodes the entire image as detailed above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

1996P08661WOUS01
Rosenbaum *et al.****Other Cited References***

In paragraph 6, the Examiner cited other references which were considered pertinent although not relied upon for a rejection. Applicants have reviewed these references and believe that they, at least for the reasons set out above, do not anticipate nor make obvious the present claimed invention.


CONCLUSION

The present response is intended to correspond with the Revised Amendment Format. Applicant understands that with the Revised Amendment Format, the provisions of 37 CFR §1.121 are waived. Should any part of the present response not be in full compliance with the requirements of the Revised Amendment Format, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned for immediate correction.

No new matter has been added.

In the event that the transmittal form is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension of time and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No.: 502464 referencing client reference: 1996P08661WOUS01. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Date: 04/15/2005
SIEMENS SCHWEIZ
Intellectual Property
IP, I-44
Albisriederstrasse 245
CH-8047 Zürich, Switzerland
Tel: +41 (0) 585 583 295
Fax: +41 (0) 585 583 228


Jacob Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,410
Customer No.: 28,204